

Remarks

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the following remarks. For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is allowable over the cited references.

The non-final Office Action dated July 27, 2004, indicated that claims 8-10, 17, 21, 23, 24, 27, 30 and 32-35 are allowed. Claims 1, 6, 11, 15 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Bingel et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,173,021). Claims 2 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szechenyi (U.S. Patent No. 5,271,037) in view of Sands (U.S. Patent No. 6,134,283). Claims 3 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szechenyi in view of Sands and further in view of *Pfeil et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,160,511). Claims 4 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bingel in view of Gitlin (U.S. Patent No. 4,995,104). Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bingel in view of Gitlin and further in view of Sands. Claims 7, 16 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bingel in view of Sands. Claims 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bingel. Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bingel in view of Terry. Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bingel in view of Sands and further in view of Pfeil. Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bingel in view of Cioffi (U.S. Patent No. 5,887,032). Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bingel in view of Sands and further in view of Gitlin. Claim 40 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szechenyi in view of Gitlin. Claim 31 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Szechenyi in view of Terry.

Applicant respectfully traverses each of the above rejections for the reasons previously presented. To facilitate prosecution, however, Applicant has canceled these rejected claims without prejudice to further prosecution in a related continuation-type application.

In view of the above discussion, Applicant believes that the rejections are now moot and the application is in condition for allowance. A favorable response is

requested. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (651) 686-6633.

Respectfully submitted,

CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC
1270 Northland Drive, Suite 390
St. Paul, MN 55120
651/686-6633

Dated: October 27, 2004

By: 

Robert J. Crawford
Reg. No. 32,122